

REMARKS

Claims 11, 14 and 17 have been examined. Claims 11 and 17 have been amended. Reconsideration of the claims, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Interview

Counsel wishes to thank the Examiner for the interview of September 12, 2006. A summary of the issues discussed is set forth in the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jaros in view of Lenz. This rejection is respectfully traversed in part and overcome in part.

As discussed in the interview, claim 11 recites that the rule set includes both card type criteria and location criteria. Also, the request is linked to the card issuance component queue or the production queue based on the requested card type and the location where the request originated. As recognized at page 3 of the Office Action, Jaros fails to teach such a feature. To teach such a limitation, the Office Action relies upon the teachings of Lenz and, in particular, to paragraphs 27 and 28. As discussed in the interview, however, these passages refer to techniques for monitoring how a card is being produced and to spool data “to other identification card personalization devices 10.” No criteria is set forth about how the data is spooled, let alone based on card type and location. Hence, both Jaros and Lenz fail to teach the claimed rule set which determines a specific queue based on the card type and geographic location where the request originated. As such, claim 11 is distinguishable without amendment.

However, in order to expedite prosecution, claim 11 has been amended to clarify that the type of card is selected from a plurality of card types and that the location criteria is for a geographic location. Therefore, claim 11 is distinguishable for this additional reason. Claim 14 depends from claim 11 and is distinguishable for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 17 includes an evaluation step where the card type and location are evaluated to determine where and when the request to produce the card can be fulfilled. As described above, neither Jaros nor Lenz teaches such an evaluation set, even if Lenz teaches a queuing step. Hence, claim 17 is distinguishable without amendment.

However, in order to expedite prosecution, claim 17 has been amended to clarify that the card type is from a plurality of card types and the location is a geographic location. As such, claim 17 is distinguishable for this additional reason.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 15, 2006

/Darin J. Gibby/

Darin J. Gibby

Reg. No. 38,464

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
DJG/jln
60868297 v1